



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/746,176	12/21/2000	William James Morrison	AUS920000765US1	2913
35525	7590	12/23/2004	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			THEIN, MARIA TERESA T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/746,176	MORRISON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Marissa Thein	3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final. .

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to: See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicants' "Response to Office Action" filed on September 17, 2004 has been considered.

Claims 1-48 remain pending in this application

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 17, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' remark that "Rackson and auctionwatch.com, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest simultaneously displaying, using a single screen image, a plurality of different items offered for auction, permitting entry of a different bid for each of a plurality of the plurality of different items using the single screen image, and simultaneously submitting each different bid for each of the plurality of different items from the single screen image, as recited in claim 1".

The Examiner does not concur. Rackson was cited for simultaneously displaying a plurality of different items offered for auction, permitting entry of a different bid for each different item and simultaneously submitting the different bids. In col. 10, line 64 – col. 11, line 1, Rackson discloses a multi-auction service where sellers can sell more than one items that can be different. A seller having three items which are to be sold, bidders may be able to bid on one, two, or all three of the times (col. 11, lines 12-16). Furthermore, Rackson discloses an Internet-based interface may be provided for the bidder such that the bidder can view selected remote auction service items being

tracked (col. 25, line 65- col. 26, line 1). A reduced size depiction of all of the items being tracked may also be appended to the bottom of the interface such that the user may review them locally without navigating to the remote auction service (col. 26, lines 6-9). The Examiner then turns to auctionwatch.com to teach the single screen image. Auctionwatch.com teaches watching multiple auctions of your choice from different sites on one page (single screen image) (page 13). Furthermore, Auctionwatch.com disclose efficiently listing an auction complete with images, smart counters, and templates and efficiently keep track of your action from one location (single screen) (page 39). Therefore, the combination of Rackson and Auctionwatch.com, taken alone or in combination, does teach or suggest the recited claim above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,415,270 to Rackson in view of the website www.auctionwatch.com.

Regarding claims 1, 17, and 33, Rackson discloses a method, system and computer-readable medium in an electronic auction comprising:

- simultaneously displaying at a computer network a plurality of different items offer for auction (see at least col. 25, line 66 – col. 26, line 2; Figure 14; col. 26, lines 6-8)
- permitting entry of a different bid for each of a plurality of the plurality of different items (see at least Figure 14; col. 26, lines 23-25);
- simultaneously submitting, over the computer network, each said different bid for each of the plurality of the plurality of different items (see at least Figure 14; col. 26, lines 23-29; col. 26, lines 30-35; col. 23, lines 6-17).

However, Rackson does not expressly show disclose a single screen image.

Rackson does disclose an Internet-based interface 500 in Figure 14 which is provided for the bidder 8 such that the bidder can view his selected item type 502, and the selected remote auction service items 520 being tracked (col. 25, line 65 – col. 26, line 1). The website www.auctionwatch.com, on the other hand, teaches the single screen image (see at least page 13 and page 22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method, system and computer-readable medium of Rackson, to include a single screen, as taught by www.auctionwatch.com, in order to track auctions that a bidder is interested in and monitor bidding activity (www.auctionwatch.com page 11). Furthermore, it avoids constant surf back and forth between multiple auctions and multiple auctions sites to find the best deal (www.auctionwatch.com page 39).

Regarding claims 2-8, 18-24, and 34-40, Rackson discloses the plurality of auction types such as interactive auction, single auction, and priced auction (see at least col. 9, lines 25-35; col. 10, lines 60-63; col. 11, lines 2-32).

Regarding claims 9, 25 and 41, Rackson discloses receiving the different bid submitted fro each of the plurality of plurality of different items; and simultaneously displaying a confirmation for the different bid submitted for each of the plurality of plurality of different items using a second single screen image (see at least col. 12, line 47-col. 13, line 5).

Regarding claims 10-12, 26-28 and 42-44, Rackson discloses simultaneously submitting a different bid submitted for each different items and the submitting a modification, canceling and revising each of a plurality of different items (see at least col. 6, lines 37-41; col. 7, lines 18-22; col. 13, lines 25-36). Rackson does not explicitly disclose the first and second plurality of the plurality of different items. The first plurality of different items and second plurality of the different items do not patentably distinguish the claimed method, system, and computer-readable medium because they impart no structural or functional specificity. Furthermore, applicants have not persuasively demonstrated that the first and second plurality of different items are critical or are anything more than one of the numerous plurality of different items that the skilled artisan would have found suitable for the purpose taught by Rackson. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide any plurality of different items in the method, system, and computer-readable

medium taught by Rackson because the subjective interpretation of the various plurality of different items do not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 13-14, 29-30, and 45-46, Rackson discloses proxy (see at last col. 14, lines 17-29; col. 14, lines 50-58).

Regarding claims 15-16, 31-32, and 47-48, Rackson discloses simultaneously displaying a plurality of different offering offered for auction, wherein an offering includes one or more items; selecting a plurality of different offerings to display to a particular user; and simultaneously displaying the selected plurality of the plurality of different offerings (see at least Figure 14; col. 25, line 65 – col. 66, line 2; col. 26, lines 6-9; col. 26, lines 14-36).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3627

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marissa Thein whose telephone number is 703-305-5246. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on 703-308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mtot
December 16, 2004

James S. McClellan
JAMES MCCLELLAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
12/20/04